

String theory deconstructed

Dedicated to Philip Anderson on the occasion of his 85th birthday

Bert Schroer

CBPF, Rua Dr. Xavier Sigaud 150

22290-180 Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

and Institut für Theoretische Physik der FU Berlin, Germany

November 2008

Abstract

This essay presents a critical evaluation of the concepts of string theory and its impact on particle physics. The point of departure is a historical review of four decades of string theory within the broader context of six decades of failed attempts at an autonomous S-matrix approach to particle theory.

The central message, contained in sections 5 and 6, is that string theory is not what its name suggests, namely a theory of objects in spacetime whose localization is string- instead of point-like. The result is corroborated by the failure of the conformal embedding view: whereas the "target space" of the chiral theory (higher dimensional vector or spinor indices of currents) becomes string theories spacetime, the one-dimensional source space does not describe a string embedded in the target spacetime but rather enriches the "inner" space over each point (spin, masses). Hence string theory solves a problem which enjoyed some popularity in the 60s namely the construction of *infinite component fields*. This problem has not completely escaped the string theorist, those who have looked at the localization problem introduced the prescribed terminology calling the strings of string theory "invisible" but did not pursue this matter in the light of quantum theoretical observability.

Even physicists who have been sceptical about theories of everything and superstring theory in particular probably react with some disbelief at exposing a conceptual misinterpretation which string theorists have made from the very start. How can that be if so many renown particle physicists have beaten the drum for string theory?

The tentative answer in this essay is that the conceptual glitch happened at a place which is notoriously difficult: the meaning of spacetime localization in quantum theory.

The natural question is why, with all the doubts about its reception, does one write such an article. The answer is simple, there is a nonzero chance that in the near future the interest in string theory will subside either from lack of tangible results or from exhaustion of its partisans.

At that time there will be a lot of questioning, especially by historians and philosophers of science. It is impossible to let 40 years pass without asking why a theory which generated such high expectations ended in a whimper. The explanation of what happened will be a herculean task, for at no other time has the conceptual carelessness, if not to say recklessness, of the post standard model era reached such proportions as in superstring theory. In this situation the existence of a theorem which clarifies some concepts as the one in this essay may present a useful orientation especially to philosophers and historians of physics.

1 The aim

...The history concludes with an unexpected and glorious success: the so-called standard model. The way in which this structural classification fell into place, and the great leaps of imagination involved, justifies a degree of hubris among the few dozens truly extraordinary individuals who discovered it. However both this hubris, and the complexity of the result, fed the temptation to go on leaping, and to forget that these earlier leaps, without exception, had taken off from some feature of the solid experimental facts laboriously gathered over the years....

Philip Anderson, in "Loose ends and Gordian knots of the string cult" [1]

There is a widespread consensus among particle physicists that particle theory is in the midst of a crisis. Even string theorists, whose immodest grandiose style of research according to the above aphorism of Anderson led to the present situation, quite readily concede that particle theory has seen better times; they however propose a quite different remedy from everybody else, namely to apply a stronger doses of the same medicine because in their mind "there is no other game in town".

Anderson's quite devastating indictment about nearly four decades of post standard model domination of particle physics by the noisy but scientifically unsuccessful "string cult" expresses an opinion of an eminent condensed matter physicist which is shared by an increasing number of particle physicists who consider string theory to represent a liability rather than an enrichment.

There is also not much doubt that intellectual arrogance and hubris of some influential particle theorists played an important role in the making of the crisis. But this is not the whole story; without the rank and file losing their critical senses in dealing with new ideas this could not have happened inasmuch as it did not occur in the previous history of particle physics.

With the birth of string theory in the assets of the abandoned S-matrix bootstrap theory, the all-important balance in particle physics between the speculative innovative side and its critical foundational corrective has been tipped in favor of the former with the result that metaphoric aspects increasingly displaced autonomous arguments. The concrete illustration of how string theory was able to introduce misleading metaphors into particle physics, and disturb the equilibrium which for several decades was the epitome of a successful balance between innovative speculative ideas and their critical assessment, will be the main aim of this essay. As regards to sociological aspects of the crisis I will

stay within the boundaries of my personal experience and focus on how string theory was able to get a foothold in German particle physics.

The central metaphor of string theorists¹, based on the form of the classical Nambu-Goto Lagrangian which describes classical strings, is the credo that string theory has to do with quantum objects which are string-like localized in spacetime. Rephrased in a way which does not refer explicitly to quantization it relies on the belief that one can embed a chiral conformal field theory, whose (classical) target structure is tied to the ambient spacetime, as a "stringy" spacetime substructure of a certain high (26,10) dimensional quantum theory. But we know from numerous discussions at the beginning of QM that quantum aspects cannot be referred to classical physics, and that despite the frequent successful use of the quantization parallelism to classical physics, the world of quantum physics is autonomous and dominates the classical world. Hence one should not be too surprised if a closer look at such metaphoric expectations reveal that they are incorrect.

In the next section it will be shown that the quantum counterpart of the classical Nambu-Goto string (or its supersymmetric extension) describes higher dimensional infinite component pointlike wave functions which can be associated with infinite component free fields i.e. *the mass/spin tower sits over one point and is not carried by a string*. The recipes about splitting and recombining of tube by which string theorists assign a "would be" S-matrix, constitute an ad hoc attempt to use the (as it turns out incorrect) metaphor of strings in spacetime in order to assign transition probabilities between infinite component wave functions. Short of a large time limit process by which the interacting operators are connected with the in- and out- going free particle configurations, string theorists do not derive the S-matrix from local quantum physics but rather define it by assigning transition amplitudes to interaction-free wave functions with the help of tube pictures which are then translated into analytic formulas (taking some inspiration from Feynman rules).

The unraveling of the string metaphor will be the principle aim of the next section. In the third section the string theorists incorrect idea about localization in relativistically covariant theories will be retracted to the very beginning of string theory namely to the Veneziano-Virasoro-Dolen-Horn-Schmidt duality and its interpretation in terms of an alleged string-like embedding of a special chiral conformal QFT into the physical spacetime. For a previous more detailed description of string theories historical roots we refer to [2]

At the root of these metaphoric disorientation there is a widespread fundamental misunderstandings of the concept of causal localization. Therefore the fourth section is a reminder of "modular localization" (causal localization of QFT after liberating it from the fortuitous field coordinatizations). Although modular localization has rich group theoretical and geometric aspects and is certainly quite deep as a mathematical theory with strong relations to operator algebras, it has little relation to the kind of differential geometry and topology

¹We follow time-honored traditions of respecting well-established terminology even in case when new findings show that the chosen name is metaphoric and without an autonomous significance

in particle physics as used particularly in gauge theory as it enjoyed popularity starting in the 70s. We will give several illustrations which show that certain geometric interpretations are not supported by intrinsic localization properties².

In the last section we will show that some ideas which originated from string theory (but which afterwards developed a life of their own), as extra dimensions have to be taken with a grain of salt. The only way they start to make physical sense is if an operational meaning can be attached. It will be shown that the high temperature limit coupled with the operational connection between real and imaginary time local operator algebra is the necessary prerequisite for a dimensional reduction without loosing the Hilbert space setting and the positive energy condition of the 10 dimensional superstring. The quantum generalization of the classical Kaluza-Klein setting which is consistent with local quantum physics remains uncharted territory.

Having outlined the content of this essay, the remainder of this introduction will be used to comment about other string-theory critical books/articles

There have been various articles placing string theory into the center of the crisis in particle physics. In most of them the validity its conceptual mathematical content was not questioned. The danger for the development of particle physics coming from string theory was seen in the formation of a monoculture within particle physics whose dominance is unrelated to its contribution to physical progress but rather arises from the influence of a globalized community and the reputation of its leading spokespersons.

The book by Peter Woit [4] places the development of ST into the broader historical context of the standard model (SM) and pleads for a research direction in which the open problems of the SM are not coupled to the fate of a misguided theory of everything (TOE). The monograph by Lee Smolin [5] addresses the problem of a scientific obliqueness caused by the lush funding and media interest of a theory which has yet to show that it really deserves its name. As in string theory Smolin upholds the priority of quantum gravity research, but pleads for a more balanced conservative approach which at least maintains quantization rules for some distinguished loop variables of the classical Einstein Hilbert theory.

The lack of a conceptual framework and the increasing gap between metaphoric statements accepted as facts inside the ST community and mathematical physics requirements as well as the resulting conceptual opaqueness have also attracted the critical attention of philosophers of science [3]. It is indicative that foundational work which has been able to incorporate even the counter-intuitive structure related to the quantum reality has capitulated vis-a-vis string theory: a framework of principles as it is available for QM or QFT does not exist for string theory; who gets involved with string theory and asks for conceptual guidelines has to be prepared to confront the surreal. A presentation of a theory as a realization of physical principles is only possible after a theory has been known beyond its metaphors. For a theory as string theory, for which its main thesis, namely that it deals with string-localized objects in spacetime, turns out

²A prior critical account similar to the present one, but which more emphasis on the sociological aspects of the present crisis can be found in [2].

to be a metaphoric illusion, any foundational placement which overlooks this fact is illusory.

Metaphoric ideas around a new theory are sometimes quite helpful, as long as one conscientiously uses them as temporary placeholders for not precisely understood facts. The complementarity principle and the uncertainty relation of QM which later were derived from noncommuting operators are examples of their positive transitory role in particular at the beginning of a new theory. However the situation of the string metaphor in string theory is quite different. It is a misleading metaphor which is still believed by all members of the string community and even most particle physicists outside. The string oscillators are not objects in spacetime but are part of the internal space. In particular the quantum object corresponding to the classical Nambu-Goto string is an infinite component wave function respectively an infinite component free field describing a mass/spin tower over one point in spacetime.

The search for infinite component fields (in analogy to the group theoretical $S(4,2)$ construction of the hydrogen spectrum) which could produce an interesting particle spectrum without having to go through tedious dynamical computations was a popular research topic a decade before string theory, but it remained without success. The existence of the solution of the quantum N-G model shows that such infinite component objects do arise (but only in 26 or 10 dimensions) if one uses instead quantum oscillators as they arise from the Fourier decomposition of closed/open strings. The oscillator degrees of freedom (respectively their supersymmetric counterparts) set the mass/spin tower as well as their relative strength in the infinite component wave function; but this has nothing to do with extended objects in spacetime. String theorists were so spellbound by their mind games that up to this date they did not realize that even though their construction has nothing to do with spacetime strings, it did solve the older problem of infinite component wave equations (apart from the high dimensions, if one wants to be fussy)

If string theory would be a consistent autonomous theory, it would be justified to pursue it even if it has no experimental support; the autonomy of theoretical physics demands to follow the intrinsic logic of any consistent theoretical idea. The incorrect metaphor of "little wiggling strings" or those big snakes which are their cosmic counterpart in spacetime is the reason why many particle physicists, when they look at string theory, have the impression of entering the surreal.

The present attempt of "deconstruction" of ST (using this word in its meaning in contemporary philosophy in the sense of subjecting to critical analysis) is an attempt to fill this gap. It probably will have no influence on the course of events during the next years, but it may facilitate the task of historians of physics to understand the crisis which befell fundamental physics at the end of the millennium. The criticism in this essay is done from the vantage point of advanced QFT; this is necessary because the standard formulation of QFT as it entered most textbooks (which in some cases have been written by string theorists) is weak on conceptual points. Hopefully this only causes a modest amount of mathematical strain on the perspective reader.

2 The Nambu-Goto model as an infinite component wave function

In this section we will show that string theory does not describe string-like extended object in spacetime but rather constitutes a construction of nontrivial models of infinite component wave functions or equivalently infinite component free fields (ICF). This is a problem which attracted some attention a decade before string theory. Attempts to work with infinite component wave functions date back to Majorana; in the early 60s they underwent a revival³. The increasing particle zoo made it seem advisable to look for "dynamical symmetries" which generate a rich mass/spin spectrum in analogy to the spectrum-fixing $SO(4,2)$ symmetry for the hydrogen atom; the problem of interactions was deferred to a second step. These attempts were based on noncompact groups containing the Lorentz groups. These attempts were without success and this kind of research was soon suspended.

More interesting possibilities arise if one goes outside groups and permits a full quantum mechanics or more generally a chiral conformal field theory on its place. Although this is not the way string theorists see their subject, it is the best metaphor-free way to approach it.

The presentation of this crucial result is actually quite simple [8] and most of the necessary computations can already be found in articles written by string theorists [9].

Leaving temporarily the physical interpretation aside, one may ask the mathematical question whether there exist quantum mechanical models which, attached to a localization point in a particular way, leads to an infinite component local free field with a nontrivial mass/spin tower. Since such free fields are characterized by their (graded) commutator functions it is easy to see that the problem of local field is equivalent to the construction of an infinite component wave function. The infinite component one-particle Hilbert space of such a model must be a subspace $H_{sub} \subset L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \otimes H_{QM}$. In order to obtain a nontrivial mass/spin spectrum the quantum mechanical objects must contain vector or dotted/undotted spinor-valued operators. The Nambu-Goto is the simplest known bosonic model of this kind. One starts with the oscillators of a quantum mechanical string and defines as H_{QM} the Hilbert space generated by the oscillator Fourier components leaving out the zero mode.

There is no unitary representation of the Lorentz group in this Hilbert space, in which each oscillator transforms according to its vector index. In fact there is no quantum mechanical space which can support a unitary covariant representation of the Poincaré group. To see the way out it suffices to remember how one handles the finite dimensional case with say $H_{QM} = V^{(n)}$ an n -dimensional vector space. To obtain the correct spin $s = 1$ unitary representation, one passes to a subspace in which the Lorentz group representation is isomorphic to the homogenous part of the unitary Wigner representation. The following two

³The guiding principle was to emulate the $O(4,2)$ description of the hydrogen spectrum (Barut-Kleinert, Ruegg, Fronsdal, Budini,...) in the covariant relativistic context [6][7].

relations indicate this procedure in the present case

$$U(a, \Lambda) |p; \varphi\rangle = e^{ipa} |\Lambda p; u(\Lambda)\varphi\rangle, \quad \varphi \in H_{QM} \quad (1)$$

$$U(a, \Lambda) |p; \varphi\rangle_{H_{sub}} = e^{ipa} |\Lambda p; u(\Lambda)\varphi\rangle_{H_{sub}} + nullvector \quad (2)$$

where $u(\Lambda)$ denotes the natural action on the multi-vector indices of the quantum mechanical states. Since the natural L-invariant inner product in the full tensor product space is indefinite one looks (as in case of finitely many vector indices) for a subspace H_{sub} on which it becomes at least positive semidefinite i.e. the passing to the subspace the Poincaré transformation commutes with the condition which defines this subspace up to a vector in H of vanishing norm. The more general transformation up to a nullvector is necessary as evidenced by the Gupta-Bleuler formalism. The last step of passing to a positive definite inner product is canonical; one identifies equivalence classes with respect to nullvectors.

The remaining problem is to characterize such a subspace. But this is precisely what the u -intertwiner accomplish.

In the case of the infinite dimensional setting of the N-G model there two conditions which these oscillators have to obey: the string boundary conditions and the reparametrization invariance condition. The corresponding quantum requirements are well-known. In the present tensor product setting they mix the momentum of the sought object with its "internal" quantum mechanical degrees of freedom and in this way one gets to the physical states. The two conditions provide the additional knowledge for a master-intertwiner which intertwines between the original covariant transformation law and a positive metric subspace H_{sub} on which the representation is semi-unitary. As mentioned the formation of a factor space $\hat{H}_{sub}$ leads to a bona fide unitary representation.

Since all unitary representations are completely reducible and a free field in a positive energy representation is fully determined by its two-point function, it is clear that the resulting object is an infinite components pointlike field and not a string in physical spacetime. The string has not disappeared, but contrary to naive expectations it did not become embedded in spacetime but rather is encoded into the mass/spin spectrum as well as in the irreducible component $u^{(A\dot{B},s)}$ intertwiners. (more below).

If one wants to cling to a geometric picture of a string, it should be a "vertical" string in the highly reducible "little Hilbert space" which is the inner Hilbert space over each point on which the oscillator variables act. Those transformations in the oscillator space H_{QM} which leave the subspace invariant and do not implement Poincaré transformation, mix the irreducible components of the infinite component field. This corresponds to the "wiggling" of the "inner" string, a totally unphysical process which corresponds to the flipping of the masses and spins between different multiplets. It is not the string in spacetime which wiggles but rather the particles in the tower over one spacetime point; they wiggle in the sense as the oscillator interpretation of pointlike fields always did to those who think that this is an appropriate visualization of free fields.

There is total agreement with the computation in the cited papers, but

there is also total disagreement if it comes to interpretation. Whereas for string theorists it is a spacetime-embedded string of which only its center of mass is visible, our derivation shows that it is really the construction of an infinite component wave function and the localization point is not the center of mass of anything.

Results of calculations often need the help of interpretation. The most famous illustration is the Lorentz-Einstein disagreement in the interpretation of the formula for the Lorentz interpretations with Einstein's radical ether eliminating proposal coming out as favoured by nature. Since string theory originated as a mind game, there does not seem to be any role for nature to play. But in both cases the correct interpretation is selected by the application of Ockham's razor; in the ether-relativity interpretation it is the superfluous invisible ether, whereas in string theory the invisible string which has to conk out.

Another comparison within quantum theory designed to highlight the magnitude of the conceptual disaster is to create an analogy between the illusionary invisible strings and a (hypothetical) attempt to attribute a position as well as a momentum on the basis of the integrand in Feynman's path integral. This actually may have happened if Feynman's path integral representation would have been discovered before Heisenberg's matrix mechanics. The nonexistence of a material string in spacetime has its exact counterpart in the impossibility to embed a chiral conformal field theory as a stringy-localized subalgebra into a higher dimensional spacetime in such a way that the latter is the "target space" of the former. This was actually the interpretation of the dual resonance model before it became re-packed into the Lagrangian setting of string theory. The target space interpretation with extra dimensions only generates the spacetime dimension but does not embed the chiral theory into this target space. Analogous to the spin degrees of freedom the degrees of the chiral theory go into the "inner" Hilbert space over each spacetime point and there is no physical interaction which is capable of transforming this into a spacetime string.

The above argument about the canonically quantized bilinear bosonic Nambu-Goto Lagrangian has an analog for the various 10-dimensional superstrings. The main difference to the Nambu-Goto case is the undotted/dotted spinorial valuedness of the oscillator variables which replaces the vector valuedness.

Staying for a moment with the chiral embedding picture of string theory, it is interesting to note that this way of looking at string theory helps to lend plausibility to restriction of the embedding construction to 26 respectively 10 spacetime dimensions. The target space of the chiral conformal field theory is (by definition) the finite dimensional vector/spinor valued index space of the multicomponent conformal current (whose circular Fourier decomposition lead to the oscillators). With other words the target space is a visualization of the internal symmetry space of the source theory. In higher dimensional QFT the nature of internal symmetries can be derived from the localization structure of the observables [10]. The DHR theory, which leads to compact group symmetries, is however not valid in $d=1+1$ so one should be prepared for exceptions with noncompact inner symmetries. The fact that within the family of chiral current models this only occurs with 26 respectively 10 supersymmetric

components leading to $d=25+1$ and $d=9+1$ Lorentz symmetry in target space has to be proven. The intuitive argument only reveals that its existence goes against naive expectations unlike. This stands out against two other facts which harmonize with naive expectations, genuine spacetime strings exist in every dimension $d > 1 + 2$ (see next section) and a more intrinsic quantization of the Nambu-Goto string (in the original square root formulation) which is based on the fact that this system is completely integrable [11] also has no dimensional restriction. It is only the string theorists deployment of this Lagrangian in order to construct the infinite component string⁴ wave function which requires the nonintuitive dimensional restriction which forces to introduce extra dimensions.

Comments about the introduction of interactions between infinite component wave functions will be deferred to later.

It is helpful to rewrite the above result about the oscillator-driven infinite dimensional representation of the Poincaré group into the more conventional setting of irreducible free fields.

For this purpose it is helpful to recall the form of the most general covariant free field of mass $m > 0$ and spin s

$$\Psi^{(A\dot{B},s)}(x, m) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \int (e^{-ipx} \sum_{s_3=-s}^s u^{(A\dot{B},s)}(s; p, s_3) a(s; p; s_3) + h.c.) \frac{d^3 p}{2\sqrt{\vec{p}^2 + m^2}} \quad (3)$$

$$\left[\Psi^{(A\dot{B},s)}(x), \Psi^{(A\dot{B},s)*}(y) \right]_{grad} = i \Delta^{(A\dot{B},s)}(x - y; m)$$

The meaning of the notation is as follows. The $A, \dot{B}$ are the Casimir values which characterize the irreducible $(2A + 1)$ component undotted respectively the $(2\dot{B} + 1)$ component dotted spinor representations⁵. For a given physical spin s there is an infinite supply of covariant fields. They are described by admissible triples $(A\dot{B}, s)$ which are characterized by the inequality $|A - \dot{B}| \leq s \leq A + \dot{B}$. For a given such triple there is precisely one $(2A + 1)(2\dot{B} + 1)$ dimensional irreducible representation of the two-fold covering $\widetilde{O}(1, 3)$ of the Lorentz group. The fact that these different free fields with the same s belong to the same Wigner representation is reflected in the fact that they share the same Wigner creation (annihilation) operators $a^*(s; p; s_3)$; their only difference is in the $u^{(A\dot{B},s)}$ intertwiners and their conjugates (the v -intertwiners) [22]. The $(2A + 1)(2\dot{B} + 1)$ column indices of the intertwiners have been suppressed. Needless to add that this objects are explicitly known. They define the pointlike covariant wave functions. The (graded) commutator of two covariant fields is a covariant polynomial in spacetime derivatives acting on the spinless $\Delta(x - y)$ commutator function. All these objects have been computed in the literature[12][13].

⁴Sorry, but it would be highly inappropriate to change established terminology even if the latter is inappropriate.

⁵These are the famous undotted-dotted spinorial representations in van der Waerden's notation.

Besides the massive family there are two irreducible massless representation namely the zero mass finite helicity representation ($m = 0, s$) and the zero mass "infinite spin" representations ($m = 0, \kappa$) whose spin analog is a continuous Casimir parameter κ . The infinite dimensional unitary representations of (the covering of the) Poincaré group leading to the infinite dimensional wave function does not contain this third kind of massless representation. The covariant form finite helicity representations lead to a undotted/dotted spinorial calculus as above but there is a small but important distinction; instead of the full range of admissible $(A, \dot{B})$ values one is only left with spinorial representations with $|A - \dot{B}| = s$ i.e. the physical spin equals the absolute value of the difference between the dimension of the undotted and dotted "Lorentz spins".

This considerably reduces the possibilities but there is still an infinity of covariant fields for a fixed s . In the case $s=1$ the field strength tensor is associated with the $(m=0, s=1)$ representation, but a vectorpotential is not. It turns out that covariant vectorpotentials do exist but only if one lifts the restriction of point-like in favor of semiinfinite string-like localization. In fact the full range of admissible possibilities of the massive case can be restored in the massless family if one permits string localized fields. These string-localized covariant representations do not occur, all irreducible contributions in the infinite component wave function are point-generated.

The unitary representation associated with Nambu-Goto string does not fulfill the positive energy conditions because it contains a tachyonic component. To remove this contribution by hand would go against the spirit that the infinite component wave function should originate from natural and not cooked up rules. This leaves the various 10 dimensional superstrings as the only examples for infinite component field constructions

The resulting infinite component field is of the form

$$\Psi(x) = \sum_{(A\dot{B},s)} \sum_{i=1}^{N_{(A\dot{B},s)}} c_{(A\dot{B},s),i} \cdot \Psi^{(A\dot{B},s)}(x, m_{(A\dot{B},s),i}) \quad (4)$$

where $N_{(A\dot{B},s)}$ is the number of particles of type $(A\dot{B},s)$ with a discrete mass spectrum. The $c_{(A\dot{B},s),i}$ is a spinorial column vector which has the same type of spinorial basis indices as the field $\Psi^{(A\dot{B},s)}$ and the dot stands for the inner product between these two column vectors. Varying the numerical coefficients one obtains a field space whose generic field element was denoted by the symbol $\Psi(x)$. The second sum goes over all admissible triples where in the zero mass case the restricted admissibility condition has to be taken.

The formula just describes the most general pointlike field in $d=1+3$. There are corresponding formulas for every dimension but the number of Casimir invariants increase with increasing spacetime dimensions for both the massive as well as the massless components. Both, the unitary representation of the Nambu-Goto string as well as its supersymmetric analog are pointlike [8] and therefore of the form of the higher dimensional generalization of (4). The application of the oscillator algebra to a pointlike string state leaves it pointlike but

changes the system of c -parameters i.e. the application of the oscillator algebra does not change the localization but modifies the relative admixture of component contributions beyond what is already done by the action of the Lorentz group.

The question of whether all admissible $(A\dot{B}, s)$ occur and if not which ones do occur can only be settled by a more detailed computation which for obvious reasons we are not prepared to do since neither infinite component wave functions nor its string theory metaphor justify such additional work.

An infinite component free field theory is still a QFT and hence the introduction of interactions should follow the standard logic of coupling pointlike fields. But instead the rules to deal with interactions rely on the metaphor of a spacetime extended string. Indeed, the graphical tube rules, which define the string theory interaction as a string-like analog of the Feynman rules for pointlike objects, only make physical-intuitive sense for genuine spacetime strings. With this not being the case, the tube rules loose their physical support and the question arises whether the transition matrix elements calculated according to those metaphoric rules fulfill the physical properties of an S-matrix of particle scattering, as unitarity and macrocausality [2]. In the case of Feynman rules this is possible even without using an operator description. For the tube rules this has not been done; there exists not even a credible perturbative (in the genus associated with the combining and splitting tubes) proof of unitarity.

The senseless metaphor of a spacetime string together with the rules for interactions which precisely rely on the presence of such strings looks to me like a particle physics analog of what J. Heller in his famous novel with the same title calls a "catch 22" situation. This mismatch could explain why in the more than 40 year history of string theory it was not possible to find an operational definition. People did not know what they were doing even in the exact sciences outside the banking sector which led to the creation of metaphoric bubbles.

We will not pursue this strange mismatch within string theory any further, the more so as there is not the slightest experimental support for the formulas which this hodgepodge setting produces.

3 String-localized objects in spacetime

The localization concept of QM referred to as "Born-localization" is based on the Born probability-density associated with x-space Schroedinger wave functions. It is directly related to the spectral decomposition of the Hermitian position operator; in fact the projector $E(\mathcal{O})$ measures directly the probability to find the particle (at fixed time) in the spatial region $\mathcal{O}$. This quantum mechanical localization operator has a multiparticle generalization to (bosonic or fermionic) Fock space, but it is incompatible with Poincaré covariance and causality (propagation in a theory with a maximal velocity).

The problem to find a localization which is compatible with special relativity and causality attracted Wigner's attention; after he discovered the first intrinsic

sic classification of (noninteracting) relativistic particles he hoped to find an autonomous path toward QFT via a relativistic concept of localization. Here "intrinsic" or "autonomous" stands for "properly quantum" i.e. without using any classical parallelism as a quantization prescription; any theory which claims to be more fundamental than a previous one, should be able to arrive at its main results without referring to a less fundamental theory. To delegate the localization underlying QFT to the one inherent in classical Lagrangians was not acceptable from Wigner's foundational viewpoint

Together with his collaborator Wigner adjusted the Born localization to the relativistically invariant inner product of relativistic wave functions. In this way the violation of covariance and causality of the "Born-Newton-Wigner" localization becomes manifest.

Of course Wigner knew that QFT comes with a relativistic and causal localization which is inherent to pointlike quantum fields, but quantum fields even within one QFT are highly nonunique and the existence of many physically equivalent but different looking free field equations during the 30s was his principle motivation for the intrinsic representation theoretical approach over any quantization methods. If one could understand a unique covariant and causal localization on the level of one particle states then the functorial relation between causally localized one particle subspaces and von Neumann subalgebras of the total Weyl (CCR) or Dirac (CAR) algebra would (at least for theories without interactions) secure an intrinsic new localization concept which is now independent on which pointlike generating field one uses to describe the space-time indexed net of local algebras. The fact that for a given spin s there are infinitely many admissible spinorial free fields $\Phi^{(A,\tilde{B})}$ and each one gives rise to infinitely many Wick-ordered composites would be of no problem as long as the causal localization property itself is unique. Despite its impressive observational success, for Wigner the setting of quantum fields would remain incomplete as long as its most important principle, namely causal localization, has not been conceptually secured and as long as the mathematical consistency of QFT in the presence of interactions has not been established in at least a few examples of physical interest. Only then, in Wigner's frame of mind can QFT be called a theory on par with all the other mature physical theories as mechanics, electrodynamics, statistical mechanics and quantum mechanics. It is one of the main points of this essay to show that *modular localization* satisfies the first prerequisite and is well on its way to settle the second problem.

A good understanding of the issue of localization also strengthens the understanding of the content of the previous section; after learning that string theory leads to pointlike generated infinite component wave functions rather than to vibrating strings in spacetime, it is interesting to know how genuine string-localized objects really look like.

In view of the fact that such eminent physicists as Wigner found the issue of localization fraught with problems and perils, the critique of string theory and the string community is obviously not just that a conceptual mistake about the central point of localization has been committed; what is really worrying

is rather the absence of any profound criticism over several generations. For almost four decades particle theory for a majority of physicists consisted in calculational recipes, formal games with functional integrals and sophisticated geometry and topology as a substitute for the physical interpretation.

The localization aspect of string theory is the most visible illustration for a misunderstanding caused by confusing geometrical appearances of a model of local quantum physics with its intrinsic physical meaning in terms of localization. There are many other such misleading metaphors obtained from naively identifying geometry with localization. One which is very close to that of string theory is the idea that one can imbed special chiral conformal QFT into a higher dimensional spacetime by identifying the range space of the conformal field variables with the spacetime in which the embedding takes place. Whereas one can find (transversely extended) chiral subtheories in a higher dimensional QFT via holography, the embedding of a chiral theory in such a way that its range space is the ambient space is metaphoric nonsense for similar reasons as that which prevents a Nambu-Goto quantum "string" from being identified with a spacetime string in "target" spacetime.

Closely related is the interpretation of the Riemann surfaces which result from the analytic continuation of chiral theories on the lightray/circle as the "living space" in the sense of localization. The role of the torus in the temperature duality relation of chiral theories in KMS states for the conformal Hamiltonian is a geometric mathematical one, its spacetime interpretation in the sense of a worldsheet is a metaphor in its purest form. The dominance of the geometric-mathematical point of view over the physical intrinsic localization-based interpretation started at the time of the Wess-Zumino-Witten model. These models were worked on before they received their present name, but from a quite different point of view namely as a representation problem of nonabelian chiral current algebra⁶. The Lagrangian point of view added a non-intrinsic topological aspect i.e. a property which is related to the Lagrangian representation but has no counterpart in the solution (i.e. cannot be rediscovered from the operator solution). But besides interesting geometrical-mathematical insights there has been no physical benefit; the concrete calculations for these soluble models are still done in the representation theoretic setting. The recent constructions for factorizing models rely on modular localization; it would be hard to imagine existence results of a non-metaphoric kind to come from the geometric path integral setting. Those which have been obtained within a geometric Lagrangian setting as the various duality statements in nonabelian gauge theory have a low degree of credibility; even in the abelian case of QED it is not really clear whether magnetic sectors really exist in the quantum setting, in particular what their existence would mean for the electric/magnetic charged "infraparticle" behavior.

The problem is not that contemporary theoretical particle physicists are less apt than those at earlier times, rather the art of following the strong intrinsic

⁶The general setting for the representation theoretical construction of the field algebra over a given observable algebra is the DHR construction of the superselection sectors.

logic of QFT in order to understand its unknown regions (which in the past led to most of the famous structural theorems) became "uncool" in the shadow of a TOE, or to say it in more high level language: it is a Zeitgeist phenomenon. If in deregulated globalized capitalism it almost takes no input in order to become fabulous wealthy, why not try the same using the deregulating metaphors of a TOE to become a dominating figure in particle physics?

The main point of the present criticism, namely the localization problem of string theory (section2) was noticed but "massaged away" by the TOE ideology and as a result the string metaphor was preserved. In more concrete terms, the commutator of the alleged stringfield associated with the Nambu-Goto Lagrangian was known to be that of a pointlike field, yet the field was declared to be string-like localized but with an "invisible" spacetime string (apart from one point on the string identified with the c.m.).

In this way the hard-won and proudly cherished conceptual autonomy of quantum theory, which started with profound theoretical considerations and Gedankenexperiments about the new QM by Bohr, Heisenberg and others and whose purpose was to abandon any non-observable metaphoric relicts from classical thinking, withered away in the view of the golden calf embodied by the string theory TOE. Even in case string theory enters the dustbin of history in the near future, the metaphoric way of its discourse will linger on for a long time to come.

Getting back to the history of localization, the causal localization concept called "modular localization" would certainly have pleased Wigner, but unfortunately it only appeared in the late 90s. Its predecessor, the (Tomita-Takesaki) "modular theory of operator algebras" arose in the middle 60s, the inspiring idea on the physical side came from the formulation of thermal statistical mechanics for open systems [14]. Less than a decade later the relation between the modular theory and wedge localization was understood [15] which soon afterwards led to a fundamental understanding of the thermal aspects of the Hawking Unruh localization behind horizons. The spatial modular theory goes back to some unpublished remarks of Longo and entered the work in [16][17][18] and [19]. Together with the modular reformulated bootstrap-formfactor program it finally led to the first constructions of strictly renormalizable QFT whose mathematical existence has been secured.

To give a detailed account of modular localization would go beyond the scope of an essay. In the following we will explain some of the concepts in the context of the simplest particle representation: a scalar massive particle. In this case the Wigner representation of the Poincaré group acts as follows:

$$H_{Wig} = \left\{ \psi(p) \mid \int |\psi(p)|^2 \frac{d^3p}{2p^0} < \infty \right\} \quad (5)$$

$$(u_{Wig}(a, \Lambda)\psi)(p) = e^{ipa}\psi(\Lambda^{-1}p)$$

We now define a subspace which, as we will see later on, consists of wave function localized in a wedge. We take the standard $t-x$ wedge $W_0 = (x > |t|, x, y$

arbitrary) and use the $t - x$ Lorentz boost $\Lambda_{x-t}(\chi) \equiv \Lambda_{W_0}(\chi)$

$$\Lambda_{W_0}(\chi) : \begin{pmatrix} t \\ z \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} \cosh \chi & -\sinh \chi \\ -\sinh \chi & \cosh \chi \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} t \\ z \end{pmatrix} \quad (6)$$

which acts on H_{Wig} as a unitary group of operators $\mathfrak{u}(\chi) \equiv \mathfrak{u}(0, \Lambda_{x-t}(\chi))$ and the $x-t$ reflection $j : (x, t) \rightarrow (-x, -t)$ which, since it involves time reflection, is implemented on Wigner wave functions by an anti-unitary operator $\mathfrak{u}(j)$. One then forms the unbounded⁷ “analytic continuation” in the rapidity $U_{Wig}(\chi \rightarrow -i\pi\chi)$ which leads to unbounded positive operators. Using a notation which harmonizes with that of the modular theory in mathematics [20], we define the following operators in H_{Wig}

$$\begin{aligned} \delta^{it} &= U_{Wig}(\chi = -2\pi t) \equiv e^{-2\pi i K} \\ \mathfrak{s} &= \mathfrak{j} \delta^{\frac{1}{2}}, \mathfrak{j} = U_{Wig}(j), \delta = \delta^{it}|_{t=-i} \\ (\mathfrak{s}\psi)(p) &= \psi(-p)^* \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Since the anti-unitary operator $\mathfrak{j}$ is bounded, the domain of $\mathfrak{s}$ consists of all vectors which are in the domain of $\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}$. With other words the domain is completely determined in terms of Wigner representation theory of the connected part of the Poincaré group.

In order to highlight the relation between the geometry of the Poincaré group and the causal notion of localization, it is helpful to introduce the real subspace of H_{Wig} (the closure refers to closure with real scalar coefficients).

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{K} &= \overline{\{\psi | \mathfrak{s}\psi = \psi\}} \\ \text{dom } \mathfrak{s} &= \mathfrak{K} + i\mathfrak{K}, \overline{\mathfrak{K}} + i\overline{\mathfrak{K}} = H_{Wig}, \mathfrak{K} \cap i\mathfrak{K} = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

The reader who is not familiar with modular theory should notice that these modular concepts are somewhat unusual and very specific for the important physical concept of causal localization; the fact that despite their physical significance they have not entered the general mathematical physics literature and remain unknown outside a tiny group of theorists underlines the observation that the mainstream of particle physics has favored geometry and neglected quantum localization.

One usually thinks that an *unbounded* anti-unitary involutive ($\mathfrak{s}^2 = 1$ on $\text{dom } \mathfrak{s}$) operator which has two real eigenspace associated to the eigenvalues ± 1 as something very peculiar, but its ample existence is the essence of causal localization in QFT.

The second line (8) defines a property of an abstract real subspace which is called *standardness* and the existence of such a subspace is synonymous with the existence of an abstract $\mathfrak{s}$ operator.

⁷The unboundedness of the $\mathfrak{s}$ involution is of crucial importance in the encoding of geometry into domain properties.

The important analytic characterization of modular wedge localization whose mathematical origin is the existence of a dense domain $dom\mathfrak{s}$ for the unbounded involution $\mathfrak{s}$ consists in the strip analyticity of the wave function in the momentum space rapidity $p = m(ch\chi, p_\perp, sh\chi)$. The requirement that such a wave function must be in the domain of the positive operator $\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}$ (the operator responsible for the unboundedness) is equivalent to the analyticity of the wave function $\psi(p_\perp, \chi) \in dom\mathfrak{s}$ in the strip $0 < \chi < i\pi$ together with the action of $\mathfrak{s}$ (7) which relates the particle wave function on the lower boundary of the strip which is associated to the antiparticle wave function on the negative mass shell. It is easy to see that the dense subspace of such wave functions equipped with the graph norm of $\mathfrak{s}$ becomes a Hilbert space in its own right.

This relation of particle to antiparticle wave functions is the conceptual germ from which, after generalization to the interacting setting, most fundamental properties of QFT, such as crossing, existence of antiparticles, TCP theorem, spin-statistics connection and the thermal manifestation of localization originate. Apart from special cases this fully quantum localization concept cannot be reduced to support properties of classical test functions.

More precisely the modular localization structure of the Wigner representation theory "magically" preempts all these properties of a full QFT on the level of the Wigner representation theory; this follows from the realization that scattering theory permits to extend these one-particle properties to the interacting QFTs [21]. But this also means that a modification of those fundamental properties, as the replacement of crossing by Veneziano duality, is changing the principles of local quantum physics which are the result of more than half a century of successful particle physics in a possibly uncontrolled way and therefore needs careful critical attention.

The sharper than wedge localization resulting in causally closed subregions of a wedge (spacelike cones, compact double cones) is obtained by intersecting $\mathfrak{K}$ spaces for wedges in different positions [17]. These intersected $\mathfrak{K}$ spaces are again related to modular $\mathfrak{s}$ operators (with no direct relations to the representation theory of the Poincaré group). Among the 3 families of Wigner representations (massive, finite spin massless, infinite spin massless) the infinite spin family has trivial compact localization subspaces with the tightest localized nontrivial subspaces being semiinfinite string-like localized (the singular limit of spacelike cones). Such quantum matter cannot be generated by pointlike fields. The case of zero mass finite helicity is also quite interesting since certain covariant potentials, unlike in the massive case, do not exist as pointlike but rather only as semiinfinite stringlike objects. We will return to this observation in more detail below.

From the spatial modular localization setting of Wigner's representation theory one can directly pass to the of interaction-free net of local algebras by exploiting the functorial relation between real subspaces and von Neumann subalgebras [17][19]. One can also use the Wigner representation data to construct the covariant fields. According to the previous section one only needs to determine the $u^{(A\hat{B},s),i}(s; p, s_3)$ intertwiners and their conjugates. This can be either

done by group theory (covariance) as in Weinberg [22] or by using modular localization. The second method also works in the case of string-like localization.

In the interacting case there is no such functorial relation, however in this case the validity of the modular theory for wedges (the Bisognano-Wichmann property) can be related to free case by invoking scattering theory [21]. The fact that the noncompact wedge algebra still permits affiliated operators which applied to the vacuum create vacuum-polarization-free (PFG) states is of crucial importance in recent existence proofs for factorizing models [16][23].

Modular localization theory reveals that, contrary to the quantum mechanical Born-Newton-Wigner localization which is related to position operators and a family of space-dependent projectors $E(\mathcal{O})$, the localization subspace in the Hilbert space H of a QFT is defined as the dense domain of the algebraic modular (Tomita) involution S associated with a "standard" pair $(\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{O}), \Omega)$ where S is defined as

$$SA\Omega = A^*\Omega, \quad A \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{O})$$

$$H(\mathcal{O}) \equiv \text{dom} S = K(\mathcal{O}) + iK(\mathcal{O}), \quad \overline{H(\mathcal{O})} = H$$

Here the real subspaces $K(\mathcal{O})$, $iK(\mathcal{O})$ are the $\pm$ eigenspaces of the Tomita S -operator. It is not our intention to explain the details of modular theory, the only point to which we want to direct the attention of the reader is the that contrary to the B-N-W localization, which leads to bona fide subspaces and projectors, the information of causal relativistic localization is encoded in *dense subspaces* $H(\mathcal{O})$ (or equivalently in the real subspace $K(\mathcal{O})$) which change continuously with the spacetime region $\mathcal{O}$ and are determined in terms of the representation of the Poincaré group i.e. all models with the same particle content have the same net of $H(\mathcal{O})$. The Tomita S -operator contains more detailed information about the interaction. For the case of the wedge region $\mathcal{O} = W$ the polar decomposition of S contains the S_{scat} -matrix

$$S = J\Delta^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad J = J_{in}S_{scat}$$

Here Δ^{it} is (up to a rescaling) the unitary representation of the W-preserving boost group, J is the anti-unitary modular reflection operator which transforms the algebra $\mathcal{A}(W)$ into its commutant $\mathcal{A}(W)' = \mathcal{A}(W')^8$. J can be decomposed into the anti-unitary reflection operator of the incoming interaction-free situation J_{in} and the unitary scattering matrix S_{scat} . Hence modular theory does not only define the intrinsic content of causal localization but it also attributes a hitherto unknown role to the scattering matrix: S_{scat} is a relative modular invariant between the interacting and the free wedge algebra; with other words S_{scat} is not only that global object which connects with QFT through the asymptotic LSZ limit but it is also in a very deep way related to the semi-local wedge algebra. In fact the recent existence proofs for factorizing models, which

⁸The equality between the commutant and the geometric opposite algebra follows from the proof of the Bisognano-Wichmann theorem [21]

are the first existence proofs for strictly renormalizable models in the history of QFT, depend precisely on this modular. Such concepts and mathematical objects one does not meet anywhere in QM. These contrasts can be traced back to the local algebras: whereas local algebras in QM are always of the same type as the global algebra namely type I factors, the local algebras of QFT are all equivalent to the unique hyperfinite type III₁ factor (the monad). This leads to the extraordinary result that the full content of a QFT can be encoded into the positioning of a finite number of copies of the monad into one Hilbert space, a potentially powerful new structural property of QFT whose exploration is only beginning.

But the fact that the B-N-W localization violates covariance and causality does not mean that it is of no use in QFT. For asymptotically large timelike separation of B-N-W localization events the relation becomes causal and covariant and this asymptotic covariance is sufficient to prove the Poincaré invariance of the S-matrix; last and not least the cross section⁹ is a probability and it would be a disaster for relativistic QFT if B-N-W would not be at least asymptotically invariant ("effectively" outside a Compton wave length).

For the rest of this section we will return to the matter of our principle concern: string-like localization.

In a theory which is generated by pointlike fields it is always possible to introduce string-like localized generators. There are two cogent reasons for doing this. One is that for each pointlike covariant free field $\Psi(x)$ one can construct an associated semiinfinite string-like localized field $\Psi(x, e)$ with

$$\begin{aligned} U(a, \Lambda)\Psi(x, e)U^*(a, \Lambda) &= D(\Lambda^{-1})\Psi(\Lambda x + a, \Lambda e) \\ [\Psi(x, e), \Psi(x', e')]_{\text{grad}} &= 0, \quad x + \mathbb{R}_+ e > x' + \mathbb{R}_+ e' \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

The first line expresses the covariant transformation property of the string-like free field which lives in the same Wigner-Fock space as the pointlike field. The second line justifies the name "string-like localized" since the graded commutator only vanishes if all points of the two linear strings which start at x and x' are spacelike relative to all points on the second string. In this way the string become visible if one enters the causal dependency region of the other; this kind of causal visibility is part of the definition.

The first cogent reason for passing from $\Psi(x)$ to $\Psi(x, e)$ is that the string-localized counterparts have better short distance properties: instead of the well-known increase of the short distance dimension (sdd) with spin s , the string localized $\Psi(x, e)$ can be chosen such that

$$sdd\Psi(x, e) = 1 \quad \forall s \quad (10)$$

which is the formal power counting prerequisite for renormalizability up to quadrilinear interaction terms. Renormalizability is however more than power

⁹In fact Born in his famous paper did not link the probability interpretation of QM with the absolute square of the Schroedinger wave function but rather with the cross section as it arose in the Born approximation.

counting. The standard approach uses properties of relative pointlike localization in an essential way; this is borne out in a clear way especially in the formulation of Epstein and Glaser where the parametrization of the freedom in passing to the next perturbative order depends on the pointlike localization in an essential way. The very nontrivial adjustment to string localization is presently being investigated. The perturbative approach to string like fields would certainly enlarge.

Another cogent reason arises in connection with zero mass finite helicity representations. In that case, as was briefly mentioned in the previous section, the admissible covariant fields are severely restricted namely instead of the inequality between the formal spins $A, \dot{B}$ and s one has the more restrictive equality $s = |A - \dot{B}|$ [22]. This restriction prohibits pointlike covariant vectorpotential for photons and gluons and metric $g_{\mu\nu}$ tensors for $s=2$ (gravitons) and similar pointlike objects for all $(m = 0, s \geq 1)$ representations. The full range of possibilities of spinorial descriptions is recovered if one allows semiinfinite string localization. In particular there are covariant zero mass string fields $A_\mu(x, e)$, $g_{\mu\nu}(x, e)$ which are linearly related to the pointlike field strength and linearized Riemann tensor local field observables. For the purpose of a compact terminology let us call the pointlike localized fields with $s = |A - \dot{B}|$ "field strengths" and the remaining string-localized spinorial fields which saturate the inequalities (3) "potentials". By appropriately differentiating potentials one obtains field strengths.

Unlike the massive case where the only reason for passing to string-like potentials was the lowering of the ssd dimension in order to fulfill the power-counting prerequisite for renormalizability, the more weighty motive in the massless case is of a more fundamental structural kind. Already in the absence of interactions the observable algebra generated by the field strength has a subtle structural property which distinguishes it from the corresponding massive algebras. In the massive case the algebras fulfill the unrestricted Haag duality namely the property that the local fields which commute¹⁰ with the fields inside a causally complete region are precisely the fields and their composites which are localized in the causal complement. In the $(m = 0, s \geq 1)$ case this is only true for simply connected regions. For a spacetime region with a toroidal topology there are additional operators which cannot be expressed in terms of fields and their composites. This property which only uses pointlike fields can be understood in terms of the existence of string-like potentials [19]. A classical counterpart (classical with respect to the electromagnetic field) of this phenomenon is the Aharonov-Bohm effect. As in most cases of passing from the classical to the quantum realm, either there is no correspondence (e.g. Klein-Kaluza dimensional reduction) or the quantum relation is much more subtle than its classical counterpart (Haag duality versus e.g. the Aharonov-Bohm effect).

The most interesting cases of string localization arises when a theory has no point-like but only stringlike generators. In massive theories this would be a

¹⁰For Fermions there is a formulation in terms of graded commutators.

pure algebraic phenomenon since massive *states*, according the Wigner representation theory, can always be pointwise generated, independent of the localization properties of the operators. Only for interaction free systems algebraic- and state-localization coalesce. The vectorpotentials and their higher helicity counterparts are string-localized but since formally free potentials can be represented as semiinfinite line integrals over field strengths these string states are not indecomposable whereas the infinite spin representation states are.

The potentially most promising application of these ideas is in what up to now has been the method of gauge theory. The gauge theory approach uses pointlike potentials and overcomes the representation theoretical No-Go theorem through scarifying the rules of quantum theory by allowing an indefinite metric state space in intermediate perturbative computational steps. This is a problem of positivity and unitarity is absent in the classical gauge theory of electrodynamics. It leads to the introduction of auxiliary ghost degrees of freedom but apart from this necessary technicality the gauge setting follows to a large extend the logic of the classical gauge setting. But formalism aims at the local observables of the theory. In QED these would be the field strength and the current including their composites. Nonlocal observables as charged fields remain outside this formalism, their nonlocality is the result of a subtle quantum phenomenon which is absent in the classical setting.

In fact the sharpest localization which is possible for electrically charged particles is semiinfinite stringlike. Since the time of Jordan, Dirac and Mandelstam the simplest¹¹ formal string representation of a charged field has the form

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi(x, e) &= \text{''}\psi(x)e^{\int_0^\infty ie_{el}A^\mu(x+\lambda e)d\lambda}\text{''} \\ \Psi(x, e) &\rightarrow D(\Lambda^{-1})\Psi(\Lambda x, \Lambda e)\end{aligned}\tag{11}$$

It is prohibitively difficult to lift the quotation marks i.e. to give a precise meaning to this formula within the setting of renormalized perturbation theory. Whereas the unphysical fields $\psi(x)$ and $A^\mu(x)$ (which only exist in the ghost setting) are part of the perturbative renormalization setting, the physical charged fields are outside this formalism and have to be defined "by hand" [24]. The idea that QED is a fait accompli is an illusion since the central object, the charged field, is at best string-like localized and the understanding of string-localization is more complicated than point-localization. The string-localized vectorpotential $A_\mu(x, e)$ which enters the interaction has a rather simple relation to the pointlike field strength but via the electromagnetic interaction it produces a rather complex string-localized charged fields for which there is no chance to relate it to a pointlike classical object. At this point the weakness of the whole geometric/topological point of view which entered physics predominantly with gauge theory becomes exposed. It offer answers to questions about fibre bundles and related mathematical subjects but does not shed any light at all on quantum physical questions in which localization plays an important role.

¹¹In the Coulomb and other representation the em flux is not forced through an infinitely thin semiinfinite line but is permitted to spread over larger part of spacetime.

The problem becomes worse in Yang-Mills theories. In this case nothing is known about the nonabelian counterparts of the charged fields; nobody was able to even guess a formally reasonable formula "by hand". This is of course the terra incognita of confinement and perhaps even of dark matter. It is clear that by replacing the gauge theoretical setting by a perturbative treatment in terms of stringlike vectorpotentials the problem of charged fields and their nonabelian counterparts become part of the formalism¹². The unknown step in this new setting is the extension of the Epstein-Glaser iteration to stringlike fields. The terra incognita of a new perturbation for strings is expected to lead to more complex calculations.

The securing of this new territory is a crucial next step in the conceptual conquest of QFT. A better understanding of the physics behind the Higgs model would almost certainly part of such progress. The present understanding in terms of the Higgs mechanism leaves a lot to be desired especially on the physical side. The structural property behind this is certainly the Swieca screening theorem which says that a breaking of the electric charge symmetry due to charge screening in a Maxwellian type of theory leads necessarily to massive "photons". Scalar QED serves as the best illustration. It has one more renormalization parameter namely a $g(\Phi\Phi^*)^2$ contribution in the interaction which together with the mass term and the interaction with the vectorpotential leads to a perturbative realization of the Schwinger-Higgs screening picture. The observable content is a massive vectormeson together with a neutral scalar field (the other degree of freedom of the complex field was the donor of the additional degree of freedom needed to come from a photon to a massive vector meson).

Even though this perturbative realization of the Schwinger-Higgs screening picture works, it is always advantageous to ask whether a certain way of doing things is still afflicted with residues of metaphors (in this case benevolent metaphors). Since the observable massive vectormeson does not reveal whether it is coming from photon or not, this anti-metaphor cleansing is physically justified. Indeed by using the BRST formalism in a perturbation theory starting with massive vectormesons one derives that in order for the BRST formalism to lead to the expected cohomological properties one needs to introduce an additional physical degree of freedom whose simplest realization is an interacting massive scalar field (naturally without a vacuum "condensate") [25] of the same kind as the real scalar field after the Schwinger-Higgs screening mechanism has done its job. The only remaining metaphoric aspect is the use of BRST ghosts; hence the last step would consist of starting with massive string-localized (and therefore "power-counting renormalizable") vectormesons and find out whether the requirement that the perturbation theory is pointlike generated (or at least admits pointlike subobservables) requires the presence of a scalar "companion". The presence of lower spin objects as a result of the locality requirement would be the "ultimate" step in the understanding of the Schwinger-Higgs mechanism

¹²Formally it is quite easy to see that the local gauge invariants correspond to ϵ -independent fields i.e. to the subalgebra associated with pointlike generators.

within a theory in which all properties are realizations of the locality principle under different circumstances; it would certainly be much deeper than the rather dull appearance of families of particles with different spins as a result of supersymmetry.

The misleading way in which string theory looks at relativistic particles can also be seen in the analogy it invents relative to relativistic particles. As string theory in its simplest Nambu-Goto Lagrangian form is associated with a Lagrangian whose density is the square root of the surface element, it is claimed that relativistic particles can be described by the square root of the line element. If Wigner would have identified the classification of relativistic particle with inventing line elements of classical relativistic mechanics instead of with irreducible representations of the Poincaré group our ideas about particles would have remained as metaphoric as string theory, the richness of indecomposable relativistic particle states would have been missed.

The central role of localization in particle physics is especially important in subjects where one least expects it, the Doplicher-Haag-Roberts theory of superselection sectors and internal symmetries and the characterization of QFT models in terms of positioning of a finite number of copies of one abstract algebra (the "monad" representation of QFT).

4 Vacuum fluctuations impede the Kaluza-Klein dimensional reduction

The Kaluza-Klein proposal originated in the aftermath of Einstein's general relativity as an attempt to obtain a geometric unification with the classical Maxwell theory by passing to a 5-dimensional Einstein-Hilbert theory and imposing an appropriate restriction on the 5th spatial dimension. The restriction consisted in assuming that the coordinate is compact i.e. circular and that in its Fourier transform only the lowest frequency enters (dimensional reduction via a shrinking circle).

Since such a descent from a higher dimensional theory by dimensional reduction through compactification of the extra dimension leads to the same system of equation as the one obtained directly (by using the energy stress tensor of the Maxwell theory on the right hand side of the Einstein Hilbert equation) the compactification nothing has been gained by having started from extra dimensions. As a consequence the Klein-Kaluza idea never played any significant role in classical general relativity.

The dimensional reduction idea underwent a revival in connection with string theory. Since the recipes of string theory only work in $d=9+1$, one needs the idea of a quantum K-K dimensional reduction in order to make contact with the real world. Before showing that this idea, in which the relics of spatial coordinated are claimed to become inner symmetries, has serious compatibility problems with the principles of local quantum physics, it is worthwhile to raise the following simple question in the context of string theory. Assuming for the

sake of the argument that dimensional reduction really works in the quantum context and leads to a 4-dim. quantum theory with an inner symmetry, then why couldn't one obtain (in the spirit of applying Ockham's razor) the lower dimensional theory directly, as it was possible in the above classical case? Does the quantum Kaluza-Klein theory unlike its classical counterpart have a special mark which distinguishes it from one obtained without the extra dimension? And to add to this a more poignant question directed specifically towards string theory, how does one know that those consistency structures which require the extra dimensions of Minkowski spacetime and the supersymmetry are consistent with the dimensional reduction process? Is there any convincing argument that they are?

In order for the compactification idea to have any intrinsic physical meaning beyond a formal game played with classical actions, one needs a structural argument which allows to execute the compactifying limiting process for a given model in an intrinsic operational manner. This excludes arguments based on formal games in a Lagrangian setting as in [26]. The ideal method would be to start from the correlation functions and the uniquely associated operator formulation in a Hilbert space and to implement the compactification either directly on the correlation functions or in the operator setting. An implementation via spatial boundary condition is not acceptable because the change of the compactification radius leads to unitarily inequivalent representations which strictly speaking represent different theories.

Hence the classical idea of simply compactifying a noncompact coordinate compact "by hand" (imposing boundary conditions) has a flaw since the intermediate compactified quantum theories do not represent a sequence of mutually included theories with a compactification radius contacting to zero. In the other hand the *formalism of open system* in which the smaller system is constructed as a genuine subsystem included into the bigger one is insufficiently understood.

To some of the readers this discussion may sound a bit like nit-picking. But the maintenance of the hard fought-for consistency conditions which led to the extra dimensional $d=10$ string theory do require the utmost care in order to avoid throwing out the baby (the consistency in $d=9+1$) with the bath water. The obvious difficulty with any quantum compactification is the ubiquitous occurrence of localization induced vacuum polarization. The only way to handle this problem is to find a multiplicative renormalization which keeps the limiting correlation finite.

The good news is that there exists such an intrinsic implementation of the compactification idea. This is possible if one permits the intermediate use of thermal physics. (inequivalent representations) and the attempt to implement the idea of a sequence of mutually contained subtheories localized inside a global ambient theory (the "open system" point of view) is prohibitively difficult. Its general setting is the Nelson-Symanzik temperatur duality. The best known case (which recently has been placed into a modern context [27][28]) is the two-dimensional one.

Theorem 1 (*Nelson-Symanzik duality*) *The correlation functions of two-dimensional*

QFT whose spatial coordinate is periodic (e.g. lives on a circle with radius R) and whose time coordinate fulfills a β -KMS conditions state at imaginary times¹³ are equal to those in a dual theory where R and β are interchanged together with space and time.

In chiral theories for which the fields obey much exchange algebras than Fermions and Bosons the temperature duality passes to a much richer selfduality.

This suggests to implement the "curling up" as an infinite temperature limit. The simplest QFT are higher dimensional conformal free fields. For a scalar neutral free $d=3+1$ dimensional conformal field at inverse temperature β the two-point function is

$$\langle \varphi(x)\varphi(y) \rangle_\beta = \frac{\sinh 2\pi \frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|}{\beta}}{8\pi\beta |\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|} \left(\cosh 2\pi \frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|}{\beta} - \cosh 2\pi \frac{|x^0 - y^0|}{\beta} \right)^{-1}$$

It is easy to see that for $\beta \rightarrow \infty$ this function approaches the massless zero temperature function of a field with scale dimension $sd=1$ whereas the small β limit at vanishing real time values behaves as

$$\langle \varphi(x)\varphi(y) \rangle_\beta \stackrel{\beta \rightarrow 0}{=} \frac{1}{8\pi\beta |\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|}$$

which after liquidating the divergent β^{-1} factor by multiplicative field renormalization is a two point function of a euclidean $d=3$ two-point function of scale dimension $sd = \frac{1}{2}$ of a massless free field. The last step namely the passing to a $d=2+1$ real time free field is best known in the form of analytic continuation but there is also an intrinsic operational way.

Clearly this kind of dimensional reduction works for any dimension and it can be applied iteratively. The supersymmetry which plays a crucial role in string theory is a symmetry unlike any other symmetry. It collapses (different from spontaneously broken) in a heat bath [29] and in curved spacetime. This brings about that this symmetry is not stable under the dimensional reduction. This would be relevant if string theory really deals with spacetime strings and the problem were to show that a 10 dimensional string can be dimensionally reduced to a 4-dim. string. But the reduction of a point-like infinite component 10 dimensional field to an infinite component 4-dimensional field does not seem to pose any serious problem, the only property which one cannot carry along is the insistence that this infinite component field is generated by a target space of conformal currents (or by the quantum mechanic of a collection of oscillators acting in the little Hilbert space over one point). The difficult question is of course what all this means in terms of the tube rules for transition amplitudes. Far from not having solved these problems the string theorists have not even asked the questions because believing in an incorrect metaphor has prevented them to do so.

¹³In terms of covariant pointlike fields the difference between a spatial periodicity and an imaginary time-like periodicity is in the different prescription of taking boundary values. In the Nelson-Symanzik duality these different prescriptions become interchanged.

Apart from the K-K interpolation there is the related question of whether there is any possibility to generate internal symmetries from spacetime symmetries of QFT. We will argue that such a possibility is excluded since it would go against the very *raison d'être* for the concept of internal symmetries whose purpose is to describe the relation between (neutral) observable algebras and (charged) field algebras. For this it is useful to have a quick look at the history of the representation theoretical origin of internal symmetries and their relation to the structure of local observable algebras.

The concept of internal symmetries was always clouded by mystery ever since its inception via the $SU(2)$ isospin of nuclear physics introduced by Heisenberg. The symmetry of classical physics is restricted to spacetime transformations. Since the concept of causal localization is fundamental to QFT it is natural to inquire whether the quantum adaptation of localization inherent in QFT could shed some light on inner symmetries. This is precisely what Doplicher Haag and Roberts set out to do in their research on the spacetime origin of the superselection rules of local quantum physics which started at the end of the 60s. Not all programmes which require such a large intellectual investment end with such a beautiful clear answer: by viewing QFT in terms of a dichotomy between (neutral) local observables and charge-carrying superselected states one delegates the issue of (particle) statistics, charge superselection rules and their incorporation into the canonical construction of a larger field algebra which on which the symmetry acts as a global gauge group with the local observables re-emerging as the fixed point algebra under the inner symmetry.

In general the field algebra does not permit an immediate intuitive access since it involves unobservable (but extremely useful) operators, but fortunately its conceptual and mathematical structure is preempted in the structure of the local observable net of algebras indexed by spacetime regions in a somewhat hidden manner. By a sequence of conceptually quite interesting and profound steps this unique field algebra (including the concrete inner symmetry group which acts on it) can be constructed solely from the properties of its observable projection. This is similar in spirit (but much more subtle in detail) to Marc Kac's famous saying "how to hear the shape of a drum".

Although there is a deep connection between spacetime locality and inner symmetries there is no support for a naive passing of curled up spatial coordinates to inner symmetry indices. Certainly the above (only known) intrinsic implementation via infinite temperature limits shows nothing in this direction.

Additional support against the string theorists view of spacetime and its symmetries through the 10-dimensional target space of special class of chiral theory comes from recent insights on space-time and the emergence of spacetime symmetries in the algebraic setting. It turns out that all causally localized sub-algebras of the global observable algebra are indistinguishable (unitarily equivalent) independent of the localization regions; in technical terms they are copies of the unique hyperfinite type III_1 von Neumann factor ("monads"). The modular localization theory (section 3) provides a relative positioning of monads in terms of modular concepts [30] and that from an appropriate positioning of a finite number (two for $d=1+1$, six for $d=1+3$) of monads in a common

Hilbert space one can derive the the full content of QFT including the Poincaré symmetry [31] which emerges from algebraically defined modular groups.

This casts considerable physical doubts on the target space construction of spacetime symmetries. To avoid any misunderstanding, it is not the emergence of a 9+1 dimensional infinite component field free wave function per se from such a target construction which is being questioned, but rather the physical rational behind distinguishing infinite component wave functions in the space of all such wave functions by imposing a special structure on the reducible representation on the little group of the Poincaré group representation which acts on the infinite component little Hilbert space. What is the intrinsic meaning of this distinction.

String theorists will probably retort that this choice is a fortiori justified by the tube rules for the implementation of interactions. But since the tubes refer to metaphoric and not genuine strings there is no reason whatsoever why one should take for granted that transition amplitudes computed in this way can reproduce those properties which any relativistic S-matrix describing particle scattering (independent of whether it comes from QFT or any other consistent particle scheme) must obey [2]. If string theorists succeed to derive these properties then they could start to claim that, even though all the physical arguments do not extend beyond metaphors, they nevertheless found by luck (but not as a gift of the 21 century!) an unusual prescription which assigns a consistent S-matrix to a special kind of infinite component field.

The prescription is very different from what one would obtain if one considers the infinite component field as the limit of finite component fields and applies the standard rules of causal perturbation theory. It is also different from what one would obtain if one would were to use the string-localized description (section 3) for each irreducible component in the infinite component field and an extension of the causal perturbation theory to such objects.

5 Particle physics under the spell of metaphors

In this essay we presented conceptual-mathematical arguments with the result that string theory is not a theory of strings in spacetime but rather a construction kit for building special infinite component wave functions with a rich mass/spin spectrum resulting from a vector (spinor) valued collection of oscillators which are localized over one point in a spacetime of 26 (10) spacetime dimensions.

This throws a somewhat different spotlight on Anderson's critical remarks about string theory; not only did the hubris of some particle theorists lead to dissonances with the world of observable facts, but even on purely theoretical grounds the theory has nothing to do which what it pretends to describe. Many particle physicists who have kept their common sense and tacitly rejected string theory because they had the feeling of entering a surreal world of particle physics, should feel vindicated with these concrete observations. This essay is intended to identify the cause of these gut feelings and give them a conceptual-mathematical expression. A theory which substituted a metaphor for the most central property

of local quantum physics namely *localization* should create discomfort for any particle physicist who kept his cool.

To perceive the extreme philosophical aberration which accompanies the conceptual blue yonder of a sizable part of the particle physics community for several decades, the reader should glance at the "paradigmatic" new insights and "revolutionary" upheavals about fundamental physics in [32][33][34]

To close ranks between believers and to convince those who still waver, the message of the string gurus is that there is nothing to be gained looking outside string theory; this is clearly the purpose behind the slogan "there is no other game in town". For many gifted and innovative non-stringy particle physicists who got the short side of the stick, when competing with string theorists about positions, this slogan took on a literal meaning.

Leaving the difficult problem of an in-depth understanding of the simultaneous penetration of different human endeavours as science, politics and economy and other cultural activities by the same *Zeitgeist* to philosophers and historians of science, I will confine myself to some observations about the environment which facilitated the ascent of the string metaphor.

The idea that particle physics may permit a description in terms of a unique theory (reductionist extremism), called a "Weltformel" or a TOE (theory of everything), certainly preceded string theory. In fact the uniqueness of an appropriately formulated S-matrix theory was the driving force behind the S-matrix bootstrap, i.e. the predecessor of string theory without which the latter would not have arisen. The bootstrap setting was not a perfect TOE since there was no place allocated for gravitation, but on the other hand it was less metaphoric than its successor. Its claim to uniqueness was based on the difficulty to solve the nonlinear bootstrap relations i.e. on the fallacious suggestion that something which appears difficult and for which one could not find any solution at the time may be rather unique, if it has any solution at all; this kind of attitude towards nonlinear structures (example: Schwinger-Dyson equations) was not new and was in each case contradicted by the existence of infinitely many solutions. Apart from the uniqueness ideology, one extremely vague requirement was the "maximal analyticity" (impose analytic properties as the calculation proceeds), but since its metaphoric nature was so plainly evident, none of the concrete postulates caused metaphoric confusions.

In fact the bootstrap setting placed for the first time an important property into the focus of attention, which before was only observed in perturbation theory (and whose name refers to a graphical property of sums of Feynman diagrams of a given perturbative order): the *crossing property*. Among the many analytic properties following from the spectral and causality structures of QFT, crossing is the only characteristic which, although being derived from QFT, can be formulated solely on the (complex) mass shell. For this reason it plays an important role in the conceptual understanding of the field/particle interplay.

These ideas, as well as their extension from the S-matrix to formfactors (matrixelements of fields between ket in- and bra out-states) have led to the first explicit construction of strictly renormalizable models of QFT within the

before mentioned infinite family of 2-dim. factorizing models [35][16][23]. The obtained results are of course very different from the illusion of dealing with a TOE. Nevertheless, measured against the absence of any existence proof of interacting properly renormalizable QFTs, this is a gigantic step towards a better understanding of nonperturbative local quantum physics.

Although the interest in the bootstrap S-matrix program subsided (and that deservedly so) with the ascent of gauge theories and the standard model, it did not fade out because of any incorrectness in its postulates; in fact all its S-matrix properties (apart from the illusion of a TOE) had a solid conceptual basis¹⁴. But the S-matrix bootstrap, as any other previous attempt at a pure S-matrix approach, did not lead to interesting and trustworthy calculations on actual problems of particle physics, and hence was no match to the rich new world of gauge theories. Such explanations are of course not entirely convincing since the sociologically much more successful string theory did not contribute anything either to gauge theory and yet it was allowed to flourish.

String theory was born at the time when the bootstrap ideas with their explosive nonlinear structures causing a "everything or nothing" attitude were loosing their attraction. The softening of this stance started with the attempt of Gabriele Veneziano [36] to find *explicit realizations of the crossing property*. This problem was previously studied by Stanley Mandelstam, using a spectral representation for the 2-particle scattering amplitude whose validity, although not being deducible from QFT, was conjectured on the basis of generalizing established analyticity properties. The proven crossing property, as it can be rigorously exemplified in the soluble $d=1+1$ factorizing models, is a delicate interplay in which one-particle poles and cuts from the scattering continuum become intermingled.

The solution which Veneziano encountered by using mathematical properties of Gamma and Beta functions, (later was referred to as duality) is not the crossing symmetry of QFT but came out of mathematics. It is important, despite all superficial similarities, to be aware of this distinction. But in a simplified presentation (if only used as a mnemonic device) one may say: "duality equals one-particle crossing", which is only possible in terms of infinitely many one-particle states with a very specific particle/spin tower. But conceptually crossing and duality are quite different; crossing has a deep physical meaning and duality is a metaphoric invention whose possible understanding in terms of physical principles remains open. The idea of infinite component wave functions as opposed to string-localized objects was much closer to the Regge phenomenology and the dual model whereas the classical Nambu-Goto Lagrangian was the start of the incorrect string metaphor.

It was already mentioned before that there have been also quite extensive and to a large extend conceptually successful attempts to understand the content of original form of Nambu-Goto Lagrangians (including the square root) in intrinsic terms, starting from the observation that such systems are classically integrable

¹⁴The often heard objection that the principle of "nuclear democracy" contradicts the idea of quark/gluon confinement/invisibility is the result of a too naive understanding of both concepts.

and determining the infinitely many conservation laws as the starting point for a quantization [11]. As expected, the resulting quantum theory had little to do with the kind of string theory from the canonical quantization of Nambu-Goto like Lagrangians [37].

Some time later another solution for two-particle amplitudes in terms of Gamma function identities was found by Virasoro [38]; finally duality was generalized to situations involving amplitudes with arbitrarily many particles by Dolan, Horn and Schmidt in their work on the "dual resonance model" [39]. From a conceptual point of view the replacement of crossing by duality was a gamble, there was really no physical conceptual support for such a step. It probably would not have been proposed without the phenomenological support of ideas on Regge trajectories. But gambles and risks in particle physics are part of the enterprise and as long as the awareness about their fragility is maintained, there is nothing wrong with such an attitude.

The next step in the path from duality to string theory was the interpretation of the dual model as the embedding of a chiral conformal QFT into a higher dimensional spacetime. This is an even bigger slip into the reign of metaphors than the crossing-duality issue. Contrary to the classical situation, it is not possible to embed a chiral QFT into a higher-dimensional QFT; or more generally, one cannot embed lower dimensional QFT into higher dimensional ones. There are of course lower dimensional submanifolds, in particular string-like localized fields, but they do not arise from embedding of e.g. conformal 26 component abelian current chiral conformal theories with the number of components being related to the ambient spacetime dimension. The claim that one can embed a chiral theory as a stringlike submanifold (or a euclidean world-sheet) in form of a source-target relation is based on the same misunderstanding as the string metaphor, though in the quantized Nambu-Goto string it is easier noticed. So the intention to make the dual resonance model more respectable by reformulating its content in the setting of a string Lagrangian succeeded only on the sociological level.

It is hard to avoid the conclusion that a 40 years lasting dominating of a theory which, although geometrically consistent, went astray on the physical conceptual side is a calamity in the almost 80 year impressive history of particle physics. For physics the aspect of interpretation is absolutely crucial, whereas for a mathematician it is important that a geometric structure is realized somewhere within a formalism; whether it is in the spacetime structure or in form of inner degrees of freedom over one spacetime event (as for infinite component wave functions) is of no relevance, the mathematics works the same in both cases.

The caused damage in particle physics is however considerable because (as was emphasized in the third section) a profound understanding of genuine i.e. non metaphoric string localization is of central importance in any attempt to extend gauge theory in order that not only local but also nonlocal observables as electrically charged fields and their Yang-Mills counterparts become part of the (perturbative) formalism. Incomplete or metaphoric understanding on such a central matter is to blame for the 40 year stagnation on such matters as

quark/gluon confinement as a non-local consequence of string-localized vector-potentials as well as the Schwinger-Higgs screening mechanism which converts "would be" nonlocal objects as the strings (11) in scalar QED into pointlike generated objects.

The simplest Higgs model is nothing else than scalar QED in the Schwinger charge screening mode. The quartic term necessary for the "Mexican hat" potential is a counterterm whose presence is secured by renormalization. QED is of course not mathematically controllable and in order to present the screening mechanism in a credible context, Schwinger invented the "Schwinger model" (2-dim. QED). The physical part of the solution is an exponential of a two-dimensional massive scalar field and the unscreened version of this model is the exponential of a massless field which plays an important role in chiral theories since it is a charge carrying field for the chiral current algebra which has uncountable many charge superselection rules ("charge liberation"). The reader may excuse this short meandering away from the main topic, but actually it may serve as an example of the many physically still relevant facts which are too small to be noticed in the pursuit of a TOE.

The upsurge of metaphoric thinking is not an isolated event which suddenly arose in the context of the reformulation of the dual resonance model. Its seeds were already there at the time when the crossing property was substituted by duality. In that case a physically rather deep but computational not very accessible property passed to a mathematical property of unknown physical content which however had the pleasant property of being computational more amenable.

In order to get a more profound understanding why, after the time of great progress in the understanding of the structural properties of QFT (the era of TCP, spin&statistics, renormalized QED), there was a turn in main stream particle physics away from fundamental problems which are intrinsic to local quantum physics towards a more geometric perspective through which the rich mathematical knowledge about differential and algebraic geometry and topology could be used for a better understanding of QFT beyond the narrow confinements of perturbation theory. This program, which received strong support from Atiyah and Witten, captivated an ever increasing number of mathematically inclined physicists; in fact for many physicists it was the first encounter with modern mathematics¹⁵.

The vehicle by which geometry could enter local quantum physics in a rather direct way was the functional integral representation for correlation functions. This representation started with Feynman's path integral in QM and its rigorous formulation known as the Feynman-Kac representation. It was shown in the work of Glimm and Jaffe with prior contributions of Nelson and Symanzik that the functional integral representation is also valid for canonical field theories as

¹⁵Far from my present critical view, in the beginning I shared the excitement about these new geometric ideas; in fact I co-authored one of the first papers (if not *the* first paper) on the connection of the zero modes in the exact solution of the Schwinger model with the Atiyah-Singer index theorem [40]. I think that every new setting for particle physics deserves some time to develop before being critically scrutinized.

the superrenormalizable $d=1+1$ polynomial selfinteractions of a scalar field and the Schwinger model. For strictly renormalizable couplings which includes all quadrilinear couplings in higher dimensions it still has, if used with proper care, a highly suggestive metaphoric value. For example its perturbative expansion contains the correct combinatorics and after implementing the rules of renormalization "by hand" and arriving at the (unfortunately diverging) perturbative series, one is usually not interested to whether the obtained expression fulfills the starting functional integral representation or not (it does not!).

A rather convincing illustration of the power of the intrinsic modular localization viewpoint as compared to the geometric-functional setting comes from $2+1$ dimensional QFT with non-semiinteger ("any") real value of the abelian spin. In this case the Wigner representation theory preempts a nontrivial spin-statistics connection and leads to a semiinfinite string localization which is the answer of local quantum physics to the absence of a geometric covering space¹⁶. This is the only example of a Wigner representation theory whose associated quantum field theory cannot be obtained by the CCR/CAR functorial construction within a Wigner-Fock space. Even though no interaction was introduced, the plektonic (braid group) statistics requires the presence of infinite vacuum clouds in locally generated states. Only for the largest nontrivial localization, namely that in a noncompact spacelike wedge region, the generators are linear in the Wigner creation/annihilation operators. Even though there exists a minimal model i.e. one for which one did not introduce any interaction-caused vacuum polarization in addition to the statistics-caused polarization clouds, its correlation function can only be constructed by adapting the formfactor program as in [35] or the algebraic intersection techniques as in [16][23] a step which has not yet been carried out. On the other hand the geometric program of constructing the operators of a "free" (in the sense of minimal) plektonic QFT by geometric ideas on functional integration of Chern-Simons actions can be considered as failed.

Geometric structures often lead to interesting consistency relations; the problem starts if one permits it to take on the role of local quantum physics. Geometry does however not determine the physical interpretation; the geometry of strings does not reveal whether they are localized in Minkowski spacetime or whether the string oscillators are part of the intrinsic structure over a localization point as in the case of infinite component wave functions in section 2.

String theory is not the first time that a careless use of classical geometric pictures generates contradictions with the intrinsic quantum localization setting. It cannot be emphasized enough that its mathematical basis namely (Tomita-Takesaki) modular theory is the only mathematical-physical theory which originated simultaneously in mathematics and quantum physics (section 3); not even the discovery of QM has led to such a perfect match since the initial matrix formulation as well as the final all-important Hilbert space setting used well

¹⁶The covering group $\widetilde{O(2,1)}$ does not lead to a covering spacetime, but the string localization is a quantum physical substitute for this classical "imperfection" [41].

established mathematics which existed before QM and did not suffer significant influence from quantum physics after.

Most statements derived from or connected to string theory, with the exception of supersymmetry which is burdened by its own defects, inherit its metaphoric aspect. The higher dimensional embedding called branes which extend the one-dimensional strings inherit the metaphoric aspect inasmuch as they are also based on a similar source-target picture in which the target dimension is connected with the inner symmetry of the QFT of the source which has unfortunately no relation to the localization in the ambient spacetime. In this case one cannot directly verify the absence of spacetime localization because there is no mathematically controllable model of a brane, their existence has only been inferred on the basis of quasiclassical calculations.

The most spectacular consequence of the metaphor about string theory as a relativistic theory dealing with spacetime strings is the Maldacena conjecture [44] about a correspondence of a certain 4-dimensional supersymmetric conformal gauge theory with a string theory in 5 spacetime dimensions in which 5 dimensions of the original 10 dimensions were compactified in the sense of Kaluza-Klein and became inner symmetries; following the standard parlance of string theorists this is the "gravity-gauge correspondence". This rather special conjecture became the focal point of the whole string community and led to more than 5000 publications without getting anywhere nearer to a proof. What makes this sociological phenomenon appear as a mass-psychosis is the fact that while most of these papers were written there already existed a precise theorem on the AdS-CFT correspondence [45]. The method of proof is in the best tradition of local quantum physics; instead of importing geometrical ideas it uses those autonomous localization and spectral properties of QFT which led to important structural theorems (TCP, spin-statistics, the DHR theory,) The correspondence theorem does not support the Maldacena conjecture¹⁷ which in turn is viewed as a strengthening of string theory. I am not alone with my suspicion that this is the reason for its being shrugged off by the string community. A single person would be reluctant in ignoring such a theorem for fear of appearing ignorant, even if its conclusions are uncongenial to a proposed idea. But inside a sufficiently large community, such inhibitions are absent.

6 A case study: the impact of superstrings in Germany

Traditionally particle theory in Germany has been quite strong on the conceptual and mathematical side. The new beginning after the second world war was characterized by the work of Lehmann, Symanzik and Zimmermann (LSZ) who discovered the LSZ scattering theory and used it to derive a particle analog of the optical Kramers-Kronig dispersion relations. The LSZ theory is a well-balanced construction in that it combines highly conceptual aspects in the

¹⁷For a more detailed account see [2]

improvement of the subtle (and before not really understood) particle-field relation with the derivation of highly useful formulas for scattering amplitudes in terms of vacuum correlations of fields.

There was a second similar line of research initiated by Rudolf Haag [10] and also taken up by Hans-Juergen Borchers, which from the outset followed a slightly different leitmotiv namely to get away from the quantization parallelism to classical physics. The liberation from classical quantization "crutches" was already an old dream of the protagonist of QFT Pascual Jordan [42], but in the hands of Haag and his collaborators it led to a profound understanding of structures which are outside the range of Lagrangian quantization as the understanding of spin&statistics and the superselection rules of generalized charges and their relation to global gauge symmetries from the structure of local observables [10], better known under the name Doplicher-Haag-Roberts (DHR) theory. After this resounding achievements in the early 70s there were several other impressive contributions, all related to issues of locality and localization. Although these results were probably not easily accessible to most particle physicist, the importance was recognized by some as it is obvious from the fact that the achievements led to 3 Max Planck medals.

The differences in style between the LSZ kind of particle physics and LQP was much bigger than that of its scientific content. LSZ, in particular their spokesman Harry Lehmann personified Pauli's, Kallen's and Jost's engaging spirit¹⁸ who always put scientific truth ahead of sociological wellness within the physics community; on the other hand the people in the LQP project worked in a much more withdrawn social setting. Lehmann's style (as LSZ spokesman) was always that of critical engagement irrespective of social or scientific status and if necessary even confrontational.. When Landau stated that there is no support for dispersion relation outside which was made complicated by the fact that Pauli perturbation theory, Lehmann contradicted in public. The favorite target of the LSZ critique was Heisenberg's nonlinear spinor theory which for a short time was supported by Pauli. This did not change the atmosphere of veneration in Munich, but at least LSZ succeeded to impeded its spreading to other places and certainly prevented young newcomers to fall prey to ill-founded but seductive claims of famous physicists.

He like Pauli often used to compress his critique into sarcastic verdicts. Lehmann did not mince his words when, beginning at the end of the 50s he criticised the bootstrap approach, the Mandelstam representation, the dual resonance model and the string theory abstracted from it. During his time in active research he successfully prevented any of these fashions to take a hold in German universities. Unlike his collaborator and friend Res Jost with whom he shared his critical views, he never formulated his critical arguments in the form of an article.

During his active lifetime Lehmann used his prestige and influence in order to successfully spare German universities the fate of getting stuck in senseless

¹⁸There was a strong personal affinity between Pauli and Lehmann which certainly played a role in Lehmann being able to take Wilhelm Lenz's chair in Hamburg as one of Germany's youngest professors.

mind games of which string theory is the most notorious of all. Shortly before his death after his retirement when he had withdrawn into private life and lost much of his science-political power he expresses his doubts that the LQP community, who was much more self-centered and less engaging with the particle physics mainstream, would be able the growing tide of string theory which at that time had the active support of Ed Witten and some other renown particle theoreticians. He wanted to know what happened at the Berlin universities in the confused aftermath of the German unification when a group in string theory was installed there. I told him that none of the quantum field theorists and mathematical physicists at the FU and TU had been asked for advice. With the death of Symanzik and the retirement of Lehmann the the engaging style of research came to an end and an "everything goes" era began which was particularly conducive to string theory.

Compared with LSZ, the public perception of the LQP community was that of a scientific life in an ivory tower. Whereas the contributions of LSZ were in the center of particle physics, the profound enrichment of LQP were more peripheral with the potential to become central in the long run. They often encountered difficulties to explain their work to their fellow particle theorist and this reduced communication in turn enhanced their separation. But the mentioned award of 3 Max Planck medals shows that the importance of their contributions were not lost on all of their colleagues outside the LQP community.

This lack of contact led to problems in getting permanent positions. As a result all of them had a much more accomodating than engaging way of conducting particle theory as compared to the LSZ community.

One would think that the deep-rooted conceptual setting of the LQP research would have been the best antidote against the tinkering spirit of string theory; in particular since the Achilles heels of string theory namely localization is the backbone of LQP. So how come that German particle physics succumbed to the string lure as exemplified in particular by the situation at the MPI in Munich and many other places including Hamburg which was the epicenter of the postwar renaissance of German particle physics ?

The answer is outside the realm of pure science, it has to do with personalities and the culture of critical engagement with controversial subjects. The LSZ school provided the backup of a solid conceptual platform for speculative excursions as well as for their critical evaluation.

This school did not exist any more when in more recent times the Max Planck Heisenberg Institute in Munich, with the Nobel prize bearer David Gross being one of its advisory board members, became the center of string theory research in Germany. With people of such big names beating the drum in unisono for string theory probably even the LSZ school, if it would still have existed, could probably not have repeated their earlier successes of keeping the nonlinear spinor theory and the S-matrix bootstrap at bay with superstring theory.

But this does not get the LQP people off the hook. At least some of the leading members of the LQP community know¹⁹ the critique in this essay, namely

¹⁹This is not hypothetical since I got an affirmative answer from at least one LQP member.

that string theory wave functions are not string-like but point-like infinite component wave functions which contradicts the application of Feynman like tube rules for transition amplitudes and that it is not possible to embed a chiral QFT as a 1-dimensional subtheory of a higher dimensional QFT. with and that people. Even those few string theorists who looked at the question of string localization [9][8] noticed the point-localization but in order to save the string metaphor they came up with a new prescribed terminology "invisible strings" thus ignoring all historical precedents in QT concerning metaphors versus observability.

Localitation and causality is the heart piece of LQP and the question arises why a survey article [43] in a joint book together with string theory contributions the authors do not come forward with a profound criticism and instead rather prefer to leave it at the kind of critical remarks which the string theorists have learned to live with? It would be hard to deny that in the times of Pauli, Jost and LSZ feathers were often roughened, but the critical balance which was kept in this way was a blessing for particle physics. Should social wellness be allowed to curtail conceptual clarity?

When the question comes up why many young people were lured into the metaphors of string theory and why the most important theoretical research institution has been taken over by string theorists, the answer is clear; the leading members of the LQP community preferred social accommodation over scientific engagement. In contrast to their LSZ predecessors, they kept their critical standards within their ivory tower.

Whereas several aspects of how string theory took its roots, and in particular the fact that the knowledge of LQP is the ideal point of departure for a critical evaluation of superstrings are specific for the situation in Germany, the dominance of string theory in other counties followed a similar pattern. In most cases it started by a few renown members of the particle theory community beating the drums for superstring theory as a TOE. What is more surprising is that those few who have the background and the intellectual capability to engage refrain from doing so. They are sceptic but they feel that the problem will take care of itself. When after many years they realize that this is not what happened they finally try to make the best out of it by accommodating themselves with the string theorists. The inevitable consequence is that the most important aspect of modern particle theory namely the balance between interesting innovative speculative ideas and their critical assessment suffers severely and a whole generation of young scientists in the area of particle physics is left without orientation. Finally the situation in particle theory becomes similar to that of the banking system of capitalism, only a complete crash and a new organization of distribution and evaluation of knowledge may secure its future.

7 Trying to get back on track: a particle theory without metaphors

The depth of the crisis becomes even more exposed by comparing the present setting of particle physics to that before differential geometry and topology entered particle physics and led to present style in which metaphors and intrinsic properties remain unscreened. Whereas perturbative calculations have an intrinsic logic which is rather independent²⁰ of the setting (functional integration versus causal perturbation a la Epstein-Glaser), the interpretation of superstrings, branes and M-theory are tied to the metaphors of their genesis.

Metaphoric arguments are however not limited to string theory; if they becomes acceptable in one popular area of particle research their containment becomes difficult. It is worthy of consideration that even those results which are by some considered to be characteristic for a whole epoch (as the various duality statements by Seiberg, Witten, Montonen and Olive) never managed to overcome their conjectural metaphoric state in which they were proposed more than two decades ago. In fact it is hard to find any physically relevant and at the same time trustworthy statement in the mainstream of particle physics which came out of the post-standard model, the stagnation has not stopped at the standard model and string theory.

The way out of the present plight is not simply a return to pre-string times. But it would require a more serious study of the forgotten quantum field theoretic achievements of the past and of those foundational insights into the incomplete building of local quantum physics which went largely unnoticed in the noise which inevitably accompany theories of everything. Without a good knowledge beyond the cartoon presentation of QFT textbooks (which often amount to a kind of string theory view of particle physics) there is no hope to solve the problems beyond gauge theory as explained in section 3.

With other words part of the message of how to get back on track is not so different from that in the present economic crisis of post cold war capitalism. Modern methods coupled with old-fashioned reason, and laws which control greed and encourage the common wealth on the socio-political side have their analogs in the turning away from the unproductive alliance between the metaphoric bombast of a TOE and the career and fame of our junior scientists.

The first step is the recognition that there exists a man-made problem, that is easier in the socio-economic sphere where there is already broad agreement that things have to change. The myth that the development of the exact sciences follows its own intrinsic laws makes it more difficult to become aware of the man-made aberrations in the case of particle theory. As in any other human activity it is futile to hope for any auto-critical attitude from physicists who have dedicated a significant part of their scientific life to string theory and its derivatives.

At least one would hope that the partisans of string theory do not drive

²⁰This applies to point-localized covariant fields but not to the string-localized vectorpotentials which are important for the generalization of gauge theory mentioned in section 3.

particle physics against a brick wall in a "string theory or nothing" mood. Unfortunately a recent quotation of Churchill's war endurance rallying cry: "never, never,...give in", which David Gross uses to rally support behind string theory goes precisely in that direction. The recovery from the four decades long reign of metaphors will need more time than one generation. The notion that one can recuperate the knowledge which was lost in decades of domination by a TOE is naive; many important ideas and their interconnections have not entered textbooks. Although there is an increasing general unease about the situation in particle physics within the last decades, its scientific cause has remained fuzzy to most theoreticians. But the clear recognition of the scientific roots of the crisis is the precondition for getting away from the present Zeitgeist characterized by metaphors under the spell of a TOE.

Experiments as those planned on the forthcoming LHC are certainly important in bringing about a change. But modern particle theory is too complex in order to be extract from experiments only, experiments cannot correct the theoretical input except in the lucky circumstance of a clear contradiction with a convincing theoretical prediction. The present situation of particle physics is more complicated than in previous times, The standard model is successful but not very credible; the success which according to Anderson claims had made some particle physicists intellectually arrogant was not yet secured. In comparison with the deep conceptual enrichment which accompanied the post war discovery of renormalized QED, the standard model appears more like an unmerited success in the sense that a conceptually rather naive proposal was more successful than one could rightfully expect.

The first cracks in form of nonvanishing neutrino masses and neutrino oscillations as well as the CP problem have been noticed, but even more disconcerting is that there has been no theoretical progress on the much too naively formulated Schwinger-Higgs screening mechanism and its "opposite", namely on the string-localized carriers of liberated (unscreened) electric charge and their non-abelian counterparts (invisible quarks and gluons) as explained in some detail in section 3.

Weighting the rather simple minded gauge group construction of the local observables of the standard model against the enormity of the remaining problems of understanding the remaining operators, the first rapid success of the model appears more and more like stumbling into a labyrinth without knowing how to continue or return. The picture of some individuals which, delirious of their success with the standard model, move to conquer the ultimate, a TOE as Anderson sees the situation is questionable since the success is fragile and the forthcoming experiments may well lead to a significant revision. The time it took to get to the standard model as it is presently known may turn out to be small compared to the time it takes to tackle those basic problems whose understanding is necessary in order to really secure the initial success. All imaginable renormalizable modifications and extensions of the standard model have already been tried in almost four decades. But the conceptual setting in which these attempts have taken place has never changed, it was always the gauge theoretic setting which is limited to QFT of local observables i.e. which are generated by

pointlike fields whereas most of the unsolved problems of the standard model involve string-localized fields. Indeed it is hard to imagine any progress without taking the step from pointlike to stringlike fields and this applies particularly to perturbation theory.

The first step in this direction would be to remove the conceptual fog of 40 years string theory on what constitutes genuine string-localization and to replace it by a profound understanding of what physical properties lead to string-localization. Instead of the string theorists "let us move from the setting of point-localization to strings" one would like to know which physical properties are incompatible with point-localization. There are strong indications that in a theory with local observables one never needs any generating charge-carrying fields which require a larger than semiinfinite string localization (i.e. no surface localized generators) and one would like solidify these indications into a theorem.

This will only work if there will appear some "young Turks" in particle theory who will find other means to get to the frontiers of particle research than through their string-believing peers. There are still some older people around who could pass on some potentially useful knowledge which was lost during the last decades. In this essay we have presented important unsolved problems which have remained outside the scope of the string theory influenced research. The only way that the "no other game in town" slogan can succeed is by keeping young motivated and gifted particle theorists in the futile spell of a TOE.

References

- [1] Philip Anderson, in *the Times Higher Education* 25 August 2006, <http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/story.asp?soryCode=204995§ioncode=1>
- [2] B. Schroer, *String theory, the crisis in particle physics and the ascent of metaphoric arguments*,
- [3] R. Hedrich, *The Internal and External Problems of String Theory - A Philosophical View*, physics/0610168
- [4] P. Woit, *Not Even Wrong, the failure of string theory and the continuing challenge to unify the laws of physics*, Jonathan Cape London 2006
- [5] L. Smolin, *The Trouble With Physics: The Rise of String Theory, the Fall of a Science, and What Comes Next*, Sept. 2006
- [6] A. O Barut and H. Kleinert, Phys. Rev. **157**, (1967) 1180
- [7] C. Fronsdal, Phys. Re. **156**, (1967) 1652
- [8] J. Dimock, *Locality in Free String Field Theory-II*, Annales Henri Poincare 3 (2002) 613, math-ph/0102027
- [9] E. Martinec, Class. Quant. Grav. **10**, (1993) 187

- [10] R. Haag, *Local Quantum Physics*, Springer, second edition, 1996
- [11] K. Pohlmeyer, Phys. Lett. **119 B**, (1982) 100
- [12] R. F. Streater and A. Wightman, *PCT, Spin and Statistics and All That*, Benjamin, New York 1964
- [13] N.N. Bogolubov, A.A. Logunov, A.I. Oksak and I.T. Todorov, *General Principles of Quantum Field Theory*, Kluwer 1990
- [14] R. Haag, N. M. Hugenholtz and M. Winnink, Commun. Math. Phys. **5**, (1967) 215
- [15] J. Bisognano and E. Wichmann, J. Math. Phys. **16**, (1975) 985
- [16] B. Schroer, Ann. Phys. **295**, (1999) 190
- [17] R. Brunetti, D. Guido and R. Longo, *Modular localization and Wigner particles*, Rev.Math.Phys. **14**, (2002) 759
- [18] L. Fassarella and B. Schroer, J. Phys. **A 35**, (2002) 9123
- [19] J. Mund, B. Schroer and J. Yngvason, *String-localized quantum fields and modular localization*, CMP **268** (2006) 621, math-ph/0511042
- [20] S. J. Summers, *Tomita-Takesaki Modular Theory*, math-ph/0511034
- [21] J. Mund, Ann. Henri Poincaré **2**, (2001) 907
- [22] S. Weinberg, *The Quantum Theory of Fields I*, Cambridge University Press 1995
- [23] G. Lechner, *An Existence Proof for Interacting Quantum Field Theories with a Factorizing S-Matrix*, math-ph/0601022
- [24] O. Steinmann, Ann. Phys. (NY) **157**, (1984) 232
- [25] M. Duetsch and B. Schroer, *Massive Vector Mesons and Gauge Theory*, .Phys. A33 (2000) 4317
- [26] N. Seiberg and E. Witten, arXiv:hep-th9607163
- [27] C. Gerard and C. Jaekel, Prog. Math. **251**, (2007) 125
- [28] B. Schroer, *Positivity and Integrability* (Mathematical Physics at the FU-Berlin), hep-th/0603118
- [29] D. Buchholz, I. Ojima, *Spontaneous Collapse of Supersymmetry*, Nucl.Phys. B498 (1997) 228, hep-th/9701005
- [30] B. Schroer, *Localization and the interface between quantum mechanics, quantum field theory and quantum gravity*, arXiv:0711.4600

- [31] R. Kaehler and H.-W. Wiesbrock, JMP **42**, (2000) 74, and references to prior work therein
- [32] L. Susskind, *The Cosmic Landscape: String Theory and the Illusion of Intelligent Design*, Little, Brown (2005)
- [33] B. Schellekens, Rep. Prog. Phys. **71**, (2008) 07220
- [34] M. Tegmark, arXiv:0709.4024
- [35] H. Babujian and M. Karowski, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A1952**, (2004) 34, and references therein to the beginnings of the bootstrap-formfactor program
- [36] G. Veneziano, Nuovo Cim. A **57**, (1968) 190
- [37] D. Bahns, J. Math. Phys. **45**, (2004) 4640
- [38] M. A. Virasoro, Phys. Rev. **177**, (1969) 2309
- [39] R. Dolen, D. Horn and C. Schmid, Phys. Rev. **166**, (1968) 1768
- [40] N. K. Nielsen and B. Schroer, Nucl.Phys. **B127**, (1977) 493
- [41] J. Mund, J. Math. Phys. **44**, (2003) 2037
- [42] P. Jordan, *The Present State of Quantum Electrodynamics*, in *Talks and Discussions of the Theoretical-Physical Conference in Kharkov* (May 19.-25., 1929) Physik.Zeitschr.XXX, (1929) 700
- [43] K. Fredenhagen, K.-H. Rehren and E. Seiler, Springer Lecture Notes Phys. **721** (2007) 61, arXiv:hep-th/0603155
- [44] J. A. Maldacena, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **2**, (1998) 231
- [45] K.-H. Rehren, *A Proof of the AdS-CFT Correspondence*, In: Quantum Theory and Symmetries, H.-D. Doebner et al. (eds.), World Scientific (2000), pp. 278, hep-th/9910074